



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/049,660 07/31/2002		07/31/2002	Sjoerd Odrik Van Der Veen	APV31542	7717	
24257	7590	12/05/2003		EXAM	INER	
	STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP 1615 L STREET, NW				BASICHAS, ALFRED	
	SUITE 850				PAPER NUMBER	
WASHING	WASHINGTON, DC 20036			3749		
				DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003	//	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary  Examiner Alfred Basichas  The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply	ODRIK
Alfred Basichas 3749	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
· ·	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	1.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2003.	
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	;
Disposition of Claims	
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(c	d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.	•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional applicat since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data She 37 CFR 1.78.  a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.76.	eet.
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	

Art Unit: 3749

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### **Drawings**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the container must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 2. Claims 1-3, 6, 7-10, 13, 17, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jaeger (3,802,056), which shows all of the claimed limitations. Jaeger shows, for example, an insert 40 including a peripheral wall with two sections of different diameters and a perpendicular section (fig. 15), an open end and smaller diameter closed end 54, and wherein the insert is produced by deep-drawing (col. 5, lines 42-64). Jaeger further shows a transition section 50 that is substantially perpendicular to the wall sections 48,52, as well as the concave hollow (figs. 24,25).

Art Unit: 3749

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaeger (3,802,056) in view of Tenenboum (6,267,110). Jaeger discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations, but does not specifically recite a the

Art Unit: 3749

use of plastic coated packaging steel. Tenenboum teaches a heating unit for food containers utilizing plastic coated packaging steel as a means of providing safety and convenience of handling. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the plastic coated packaging steel as taught by Tenenboum into the invention disclosed by Jaeger, so as to provide for safety and convenience of handling.

7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaeger (3,802,056), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations, but does not specifically recite the proportions recited in the claim. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the claimed proportions into the invention disclosed by Jaeger, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

#### Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 3749

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 703 306 3476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on 703 308 0101. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0861.

December 1, 2003

Alfed Basichas Primary Examiner 703 306 3476